



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/516,568	08/18/2005	Mark Arnoldovich Kaufman	V-302	4965
802	7590	05/28/2009		
PATENTTM.US P. O. BOX 82788 PORTLAND, OR 97282-0788			EXAMINER	
			NEWAY, BLAINE GIRMA	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3728				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/28/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/516,568	Applicant(s) KAUFMAN, MARK ARNOLDOVICH
	Examiner BLAINE G. NEWAY	Art Unit 3728

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 May 2009.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 01 December 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/1449B)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/11/09 has been entered. Claims 1 and 10 are pending in the application; and claims 2-9 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims are unclear as they are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

The claims recite the limitation "the lower part" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

The claims recite the limitation "each pivot" in line 7. It is unclear how many pivots are being claimed.

The claims recite the limitation "at the base bottom" in line 8. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. A "base bottom" has not been previously claimed.

The claims recite the limitation "the initial position" it is unclear whether the initial position is the open position, the closed position or the position in between the closed and open position.

The claims recite the limitation "the weight of the filled glass container". The claims are indefinite since the "the glass container" has not been positively defined in the claims. The structural limitation of the box relative to an imaginary device is indefinite. It is unclear whether applicant is intending to claim a combination of a box for a glass container and a glass container or just the box. For examination purposes, the examiner will treat such references to the firework as merely the applicant's statements of intended use for the launching panel in order to give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation pursuant to PTO practice.

Claim element "means for arranging" in claim 10 is a means (or step) plus function limitation that invokes 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. However, the written description fails to disclose the corresponding structure, material, or acts for the claimed function.

Applicant is required to:

- (a) Amend the claim so that the claim limitation will no longer be a means (or step) plus function limitation under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph; or

(b) Amend the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)).

If applicant is of the opinion that the written description of the specification already implicitly or inherently discloses the corresponding structure, material, or acts so that one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize what structure, material, or acts perform the claimed function, applicant is required to clarify the record by either:

(a) Amending the written description of the specification such that it expressly recites the corresponding structure, material, or acts for performing the claimed function and clearly links or associates the structure, material, or acts to the claimed function, without introducing any new matter (35 U.S.C. 132(a)); or

(b) Stating on the record what the corresponding structure, material, or acts, which are implicitly or inherently set forth in the written description of the specification, perform the claimed function. For more information, see 37 CFR 1.75(d) and MPEP §§ 608.01(o) and 2181.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claims 1 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morgan (US 189,899).

Morgan discloses a box (for a glass container) having a body consisting of two parts A (with a lower portion of the parts being used for interacting with a supporting surface); and a base B capable of arranging at least one glass container. Morgan further discloses each part A of the body being pivotally connected to the base B by hinge g, and the base B being capable of being raised when the body parts A are opened in the opposite directions; the hinge g being located at the bottom of the base B, away from the external border (where stop c is located) of the corresponding part of the body; wherein the distance between the pivots is zero (i.e. less than the width of the base B), and the distance is selected according to a condition excluding the return of the body parts A to a closed position by the weight of the base B and the weight of an appropriately sized glass container at a preset opening angle of the body parts A. Morgan also discloses the body parts A being provided with a limiter f and a means c capable of arranging an appropriately sized glass container (figures 1-3). With respect to the claim and the preset opening angle and weight of the glass and the pivot points, all the functional claim language and statements of intended use do not make an otherwise unpatentable claim patentable. It is believed to be well settled that "recitation with respect to manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying structural limitations of that claimed," *Ex parte Masham 2 USPQ2nd 1674.*

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Contrary to applicant's argument it is noted that all the functional claim language and statements of intended use do not make an otherwise unpatentable claim patentable. It is believed to be well settled that "recitation with respect to manner in which claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate claimed apparatus from prior art apparatus satisfying structural limitations of that claimed," *Ex parte Masham* 2 USPQ2nd 1674. Also *Ex parte Casey* 152 USPQ 235. The law of anticipation does not require that an anticipatory reference teach what the applicant is claiming or has disclosed, but only that the claims "read on" something disclosed in the reference, i.e., all limitations of the claim are found in the reference. See *Kalman v. Kimberly Clark Corp.*, 713 F.2d 760, 218 USPQ 871 (Fed Cir. 1983). Furthermore, it is only necessary that the reference include structure capable of performing the recited function in order to meet the functional limitations of a claim. See *In re Mott*, 557 F.2d 266, 194 USPQ 305 (CCPA 1977). Since the reference device has all of the same structural elements, as noted above, it would clearly seem to be inherently capable of performing the functions as claimed. Note also that most of the distinctions argued are not present in the claims.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BLAINE G. NEWAY whose telephone number is (571)270-5275. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 AM- 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 571 272-4562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JILA M MOHANDESI/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3728

BGN
05/26/09